R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 011 SP 000 764

ELEMENTS OF GRADUATE ORGANIZATION IN TEN UNIVERSITIES.

BY- MCKENZIE, WILLIAM R.
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV., CARBONDALE

PUB DATE 27 DEC 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.04 26P.

DESCRIPTORS- DEGREES (TITLES), EDUCATION MAJORS, *GRADUATE STUDY, *PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, *UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, CARBONDALE

THE GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION OF 10 (MOSTLY MIDWESTERN STATE) UNIVERSITIES WERE EXAMINED TO DETERMINE HOW THEY RELATE TO THE GRADUATE OFFICE, THE TYPES OF DEGREES GRANTED, AND THE QUALITY OF THEIR PROGRAMS. EACH OF THE 10 GRADUATE DEANS, AS WELL AS OTHER INVOLVED PERSONS, WERE INTERVIEWED, AND PRINTED MATERIAL, INCLUDING THE GRADUATE BULLETINS, WERE READ. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WERE--(1) NONE OF THE GRADUATE OFFICES DEVOTED AN AMOUNT OF TIME TO THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION COMMENSURATE WITH THE NUMBER OF ITS STUDENTS AND SHOULD BEGIN TO DO SO, (2) MOST GRADUATE STUDENTS IN EDUCATION WERE NOT MAKING USE OF THE FULL RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR THEIR PROGRAMS AND SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO DO SO, (3) THE VARIETY AND NUMBER OF GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED WERE TOO CONFUSING, SERVE LITTLE PURPOSE, AND SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ONE CONSISTENT PATTERN, AND (4) GRADUATE DEGREES IN EDUCATION DO NOT HAVE THE STATUS OF DEGREES IN OTHER FIELDS AND THE PH.D. SHOULD BE THE ONLY TERMINAL DEGREE IN EDUCATION. (AW)

00764

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JAN 24 1967
copy 2
A9

ED011011

SP 000 764

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Carbondale, Illinois

ELEMENTS OF GRADUATE ORGANIZATION IN TEN UNIVERSITIES

William R. McKenzie

Graduate School and College of Education

December 27, 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Institutions Visited	1
	Sources of Information	1
	Instability of the Office of Graduate Dean	2
II.	GRADUATE ORGANIZATION	3
	Graduate Office Personnel	3
	Numbers of Students	3
	Personnel Student Ratio	4
	Specialized Deans	5
	Associate and Assistant Deans	6
	Specialized Graduate Organizations	6
	Graduate Deans in Other Units	6
	Graduate Deans and Other Deans	7
	The Dean and the Graduate Faculty	7
	The Dean and the Graduate Council	7
	The Dean and Graduate Programs	10
	Purpose and Performance	10
	Objectives of the Graduate Office	11
	Strengths of the Graduate Office	12
	The Tenure of Graduate Deans	12
	The Lack of a Common Tradition	12
	The Mood of Graduate Offices	12
III.	GRADUATE OFFICE AND THE RESEARCH FUNCTION	13
	Responsibility for the Research Function	13
	The Graduate Dean and Research Administration	14
	Research Services of the Graduate Dean	14
	Graduate Function and Research Function	14
IV.	GRADUATE OFFICE AND EDUCATION	15
	Education as a Graduate Concern	15
	The Graduate Dean and Education Programs	15
	Resources for Education Programs	15
	Advisement for Education Programs	16
	Graduate Degrees in Education	16
	Programs in Foundations of Education	17
	The Ed.D. and Ph.D. in Education	17
	Status of Graduate Degrees in Education	18
	Status and Understanding of Education Programs	18
V.	CONCLUSIONS	18
	The Graduate Organization	18
	The Graduate Office and the Research Function	20
	The Graduate Office and Education	21
	Leadership and Graduate Studies	22

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Carbondale, Illinois
December 27, 1965

* * *

ELEMENTS OF GRADUATE ORGANIZATION IN TEN UNIVERSITIES

William R. McKenzie

During late August and early September, 1965, ten institutions of higher education were visited under the sponsorship of the Graduate School and the College of Education. Prior to the visits conferences were held with responsible officers of the two University units and arrangements made with the relevant officials of the institutions to be visited. The following document is a report of the results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Institutions Visited. The ten institutions visited are given below in alphabetical order. They were not visited in that order, however, but in a great circle: University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, Oklahoma State University at Stillwater, University of Oklahoma at Norman, University of New Mexico at Albuquerque, University of Denver in Colorado, University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado State College at Greeley, Kansas State University at Manhattan, University of Kansas at Lawrence, and University of Missouri at Columbia. It will be noted that all of them are state institutions except the University of Denver, which is private, and that all of them are entitled universities except Colorado State College, which might be said to be a university in terms of functions, including the awarding of degrees through the doctorate. Keeping these exceptions in mind, the following report represents data gathered from virtually all of the state universities in the region covered.

University of Arkansas
University of Colorado
Colorado State College
University of Denver
University of Kansas
Kansas State University
University of Missouri
University of New Mexico
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University

Sources of Information. Graduate bulletins were obtained from the institutions and studied prior to the visits, of course. Other printed material was also subsequently secured, and conversations held with other

persons, but the bulk of the information came from oral communications, interviews, with the following officials of the ten universities.

Arkansas	Virgil W. Adkisson, Dean of the Graduate School and Research Coordinator Aubrey Harvey, Assistant Research Coordinator
Colorado	Dorothy Stauber, Administrative Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School
Colo. S. C.	Frank Lakin, Administrative Assistant to the President, former Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate Division
Denver	Wilbur C. Miller, Dean of the Graduate College and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
Kansas	William P. Albrecht, Dean of the Graduate School Harold Orel, Assistant Dean of the Faculties
Kans. State	John L. Brown, Dean of the Graduate School and Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs
Missouri	C. Edmund Marshall, Associate Dean of the Graduate School
New Mexico	Shirley Earickson, Administrative Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School Harold Walker, Director of Research Services
Oklahoma	Arthur H. Doerr, Dean of the Graduate College Carl D. Riggs, Dean of the Graduate College
Okla. State	James H. Boggs, Dean of the Graduate School

Every person interviewed was quite knowledgeable and most cooperative, and, of course, none are responsible for any errors which might appear in this report. The fact that the visits were undertaken during what was a normal academic vacation period for many institutions did not prove to be any limitation.

Instability of the Office of Graduate Dean. The most obvious feature of graduate programs in the region studied is the current lack of stability in the office of graduate dean. At the University of Colorado, Dean E. James Archer had only recently reported for duty. At the University of Denver, Dean Wilbur C. Miller had just been selected as the new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, so was in fact acting as dean of the Graduate College. At Kansas State University, Dean John L. Brown was also acting as Vice President for Academic Affairs. The new Dean of the Graduate School at the University of New Mexico, George P. Springer, had not yet arrived at the time of the visit. At the University of Oklahoma, there were

two deans of the Graduate College; it was the last day of duty for Dean Arthur H. Doerr and the first day for Dean Carl D. Riggs. The Dean of the Graduate School at Oklahoma State University, James H. Boggs, was completing his first year at the time of the visit and intended to devote full time to the position for the first time the following year.

II. GRADUATE ORGANIZATION

Information was sought on a number of points having to do with the organization of the graduate office and the functions of graduate deans. Among them were such subjects as the graduate office personnel, ratios of personnel to students, associate and assistant deans, graduate deans in other units of the university, the relation of the graduate dean to other deans, functional relationships of the dean to programs, the objectives of the graduate office, and outstanding strengths of the graduate office.

Graduate Office Personnel. As shown in the table below, graduate offices of the ten universities employ a variety of personnel.

University	Dean	Assoc Dean	Asst Dean	Asst to Dean	Adm Asst	Off Mgr	Adm Sec	Sec	Clerk Typ	Stud
Arkansas	1		1					1	1	yes
Colorado	1	2	1	1	1			4	4	no
Colo. S. C.	1			1				4½		yes
Denver	1							1	2	yes
Kansas	1	2	1					5		yes
Kans. State	1	1				1		1	3	yes
Missouri	1	1						4		yes
New Mexico	1		2		1			2	3	yes
Oklahoma	1	1		1			1	1	1	yes
Okla. State	1				1			4	2	no

All of the ten programs have a dean, of course. However, at least three of them are functionally part-time deans as far as the graduate office is concerned. Five of the universities employ a total of seven associate deans and four of them employ a total of five assistant deans. Several of them have assistants to the dean, administrative assistants, office managers, or administrative secretaries. Eight of them use student help.

Numbers of Students. The number of graduate students in each of the ten universities varied from 950 to 2,900 students, as given in the table below. These figures are based upon a tally or an estimate for a recent term. Where it had not already been done, the figures have been rounded off to the nearest fifty students. These figures include both full-time and

Arkansas	1500	part-time students, the figures for each separately
Colorado	2100	being available or estimated in only four cases of
Colo. S. C.	950	the ten. As a matter of fact, it proved difficult
Denver	1800	to get any type of consistent breakdown of the total
Kansas	2700	enrollment, the number of doctoral students only
Kans. State	1250	being available or estimated in three cases and
Missouri	2500	graduate students in a particular field, Education,
New Mexico	2000	being available or estimated in only seven cases.
Oklahoma	2900	One can only conclude that insofar as the graduate
Okla. State	1800	office is concerned with student accounting, the most

essential data about the student is the fact of his enrollment. His curriculum and level and mode of attendance seem to be secondary. This may be due to an emphasis upon a particular kind of record keeping function of the graduate office, the recording procedures and effort for any enrolled student being roughly the same.

Personnel Student Ratio. Some of the figures presented here for graduate office personnel, especially below the assistant dean level, may be in error. Certainly there are wide differences in conception and practice as to who serves the graduate office. Many of the figures for the number of students are estimations, albeit informed ones, but even if they were not there would still be wide differences in the practice of student accounting. As a result of such considerations, no great reliance should be put upon any computation of personnel student ratios. The most one could hope for would be an indication, a general idea.

Arkansas	2	1500	750	A study of the personnel table on page
Colorado	4	2100	525	three will show that the total personnel
Colo. S. C.	1	950	950	of the graduate office may be con-
Denver	1	1800	1800	veniently divided into two categories.
Kansas	4	2700	675	Through the dean, the associate dean,
Kans. State	2	1250	625	and the assistant dean, the personnel
Missouri	2	2500	1225	is primarily academic in nature. It is
New Mexico	3	2000	667	the proportion of these which is given
Oklahoma	2	2900	1450	in the table to the left. For example,
Okla. State	1	1800	1800	the University of New Mexico has one
Total	22	19500	886	dean and two assistant deans and 2,000

students, a proportion of one dean to 667 graduate students. In total, the ten universities have twenty two graduate deans of all kinds and 19,500 graduate students, for an average of one graduate dean to 886 students.

From the assistant to the dean through the clerk typist another type of professional service is rendered to the graduate program, one which might be called administrative and clerical, there being no purpose served at this point in separating the two. Using the same numbers of students as above, the proportion of administrative and clerical personnel to students is given in the table below. For example, the University of Kansas has five such employees and with 2,700 students the proportion is one administrative and clerical person in the graduate office to 540 students. The average for the entire ten universities is 379 graduate students for each

Arkansas	2	750
Colorado	10	210
Colo. S. C.	5½	173
Denver	3	600
Kansas	5	540
Kans. State	5	250
Missouri	4	625
New Mexico	6	333
Oklahoma	4	725
Okla. State	7	257
Total	51½	379
Arkansas	4	375
Colorado	14	150
Colo. S. C.	6½	146
Denver	4	450
Kansas	9	300
Kans. State	7	179
Missouri	6	417
New Mexico	9	222
Oklahoma	6	483
Okla. State	8	225
Total	73½	265

administrative and clerical worker in the office of the graduate school. The range is much greater in this table than it is in the one above it, reflecting, perhaps, more unreliability of data.

The number of students per graduate personnel gets smaller, of course, when the two sets of figures are combined. This has been done in the table to follow. The proportions run from one person in the graduate office to 146 students to one to 483 students. The average is one person in the graduate office to 265 graduate students.

None of the above figures include student workers which are used by eight of the ten graduate offices. Their inclusion would lower the number somewhat, but due to the fact that they are part time and irregular their contribution is probably of little significance. The highest number reported to be employed was four and the highest number in terms of full time equivalent employees was two.

These averages could be adjusted in a variety of ways. It seems reasonable that if there are errors concerning the administrative and clerical ratio they must be on the conservative side. On the other hand, the fact that many of the deans, the academic personnel, have duties not directly connected with graduate work would call for adjustments upward in the number of students to each of them. It would perhaps be better to leave well enough alone and to use these proportions hypothetically for what they are worth until a more reliable computation can be made.

Specialized Deans. In the ten universities, as reported in the personnel table on page three, there are twelve associate and assistant deans. A question might be raised as to what these secondary deans do, as to their functions. Do the associate deans do the same things that the deans do? Are the assistant deans assisting the deans in their normal duties? Or, are the associate and assistant deans usually assigned a sphere of operation of their own? In other words, are they specialized? Although they are not always given the specific titles listed, the answer is given in the table below.

With the exception of one associate dean at the University of Kansas and a new assistant dean at Kansas State, all of the secondary deans are to some extent specialized. Even the Kansas associate dean has special responsibilities for the administration of the graduate office. Some, of course, do not devote full time to their specialization. The two associate deans at Colorado, for instance, while full time deans, devote only one half time to their areas of specialization. It would seem fair to conclude that in the region studied associate and assistant deans are usually associate

deans and assistant deans for . . . something. What the something is, however, may turn out to be quite different in different universities.

University	Assoc	Asst	Specialization
Arkansas		1	Assistant Dean for the Medical Center
Colorado	2	1	Associate Dean for Humanities Associate Dean for Physical Sciences Assistant Dean for Research
Kansas	2	1	Associate Dean for the Medical Center Assistant Dean for Foreign Students
Kans. State		1	
Missouri	1		Associate Dean for Foundation and University Fellowships
New Mexico		2	Assistant Dean for Science and Engineering Assistant Dean for Humanities
Oklahoma	1		Associate Dean for the Medical Center

Associate and Assistant Deans. Some of the universities were found to have associate deans, some to have assistant deans, and some to have both. The difference does not seem to be related to their specialization, hence from the subjects listed in the titles above one could not predict which would require associate or assistant deans. The table above will show that there are two associate deans and one assistant dean for Medicine, for instance. However, this should lead no one to conclude that the two titles are being used synonymously. On the contrary, it was found that a clear distinction is generally made between the two. The titles were chosen in most cases for clearly stated reasons. In all cases the associate dean was considered to be the more responsible academic officer.

Specialized Graduate Organizations. In a case or two there were found specialized graduate organizations, such as a Graduate College of Engineering, in which the organization may have its own graduate dean independent of the graduate dean of the university. Throughout the ten universities there appeared to be little support for such an arrangement, the universal recommendation being that the graduate dean be responsible for the graduate programs of even specialized graduate departments, schools, and colleges.

Graduate Deans in Other Units. One question which was raised was whether there were associate or assistant deans in other units of the

university who have a primary responsibility for graduate study in that unit. In only one case could such a position be found, and in no case was it highly recommended. In the usual case, such as for the medical centers and schools mentioned above, the associate and assistant deans are associate deans and assistant deans of the graduate school or college.

Graduate Deans and Other Deans. In relation to deans of other units of the university, graduate deans generally consider themselves as a dean among deans. Their status, however, seems to run from that of a sort of senior dean to one of dependence. The former is indicated in a number of ways, including a close alliance with the office of chief academic officer of the university. The latter seems to be due largely to customary budgetary arrangements. The lack of a faculty of their own, and the consequent budget which goes along with such a faculty, represents a serious limitation upon the activities of the graduate dean and makes it necessary for him to advance graduate studies through other mechanisms. This makes persuasion a primary tool of his administration and force of personality its engine. This is augmented, however, by participation in various university councils and committees and by participation in the selection of members of the graduate faculty.

The Dean and the Graduate Faculty. In one of the ten universities the graduate faculty has been abandoned. The reasons given were that it no longer served any purpose, that the work was being done in the colleges, that the distinction between the graduate faculty and other faculties was artificial, that the graduate dean approved the teachers of all graduate courses anyway, that the graduate dean participated in determining salary increases, and that while the graduate faculty was making policy in principle it was really being made by the graduate council.

On the other hand, the great majority of the graduate deans seem to consider the graduate faculty a very important body and a great deal of effort is devoted to defining its composition, frequently making a distinction between two or three grades; members, associate members, and adjunct members for instance; or a distinction of duration; permanent or temporary. In all such cases recommendations for membership in the graduate faculty originates with the department, either as a whole or through the chairman. From here the approval is handled in a number of ways. In one case approval must be given by members of the same department who are already members of the graduate faculty. In another, approval must be given by a subject matter area group, a division of graduate studies. In two cases an application must be approved by the dean of the undergraduate college. The next step, in about one half of the cases, is the approval of the graduate dean, which represents the final approval. In one case it is reviewed by the graduate dean before being approved by the graduate council. Graduate council approval is needed in about one half of the cases and is final in all except one, where the final approval is granted by the graduate faculty.

The Dean and the Graduate Council. It was invariably found that the graduate dean is the chairman of the graduate council. Members of the

council may be elected, or appointed, or more frequently a mixture of both. Usually the primary function of the council is advisory, either by statute or common practice.

It proved difficult to get statutes, by-laws, or operating papers of graduate schools, but four were secured. The situations exemplified by the three excerpts given below, however, seem to be typical.

University of Arkansas, "Structure and Operation of the Graduate School." Revised as of 14 February, 1955.

B. The Graduate Council
   1. Membership:
      b. Each member of the Graduate Council . . . shall be appointed by his College Dean with the concurrence of the Dean of the Graduate School or he may be elected by the college faculty at the discretion of his Dean.
      d. Reappointment or re-election of any member shall be at the discretion of his Dean.
   2. Functions:
      a. To advise the Dean in the administration of the Graduate School.
      b. To recommend new programs or changes in existing programs to the University Administration.
   3. Meetings:
      a. The Graduate Council shall meet on call of the Dean of the Graduate School.

C. Dean of the Graduate School
   1. Functions:
      b. The Dean shall preside at all meetings of the Graduate Council.
      c. The Dean shall recommend candidates for advanced degrees, consulting the Graduate Council at his discretion.

Meetings of the graduate faculty are also called by the dean, of which he is apparently also the chairman. He and the council determine its agenda. The only clearly defined function of the graduate faculty seems to be to meet at least once each semester. The only function the council has in its own right is to pass on requests for approval of new members of the graduate faculty.

University of Colorado, "Statutes of the Graduate School," March, 1951. Revised to conform with the "Rules of the Regents," and to include actions of the Graduate Faculty through December, 1962.

I. Organization
   1. Faculty

Appointment

All appointments to the Graduate Faculty will be made . . . upon the recommendation of the Head or Chairman of the department concerned and with the approval of the Dean. In case of a conflict of judgment between these persons the final decision shall be made by the Executive Committee of the Graduate School.

2. Standing Committees

Committees

a. Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Dean, the Associate Dean, the Assistant Dean, and the Secretary of the Faculty of the Graduate School and 7 other professors appointed by the President . . . .
The Executive Committee shall perform such duties as are delegated to it by the Faculty and shall decide upon such details of administration as are referred to it by the Dean.

Note that the second paragraph of item I, 2, Committees, a, states that the Executive Committee, the graduate council, shall perform such duties as are delegated to it by the graduate faculty. However, in a document of forty six pages the duties of the graduate faculty are never mentioned again. One is left with the question, what is to delegate?

University of Denver, "Organization and Functions of the Graduate Council," Passed: Council 1/6/65. Approved: Chancellor 2/9/65.

Membership of the Graduate Council

1. The Dean of the Graduate College, who shall be Chairman of the Graduate Council.

Functions of the Graduate Council

1. The Graduate Council shall establish policies for the determination of standards for all graduate programs in the University. All such policies shall require the final approval of the Chancellor.
2. The Graduate Council shall . . . review all proposed as well as selected existing graduate programs of the University and make recommendations to the appropriate administrative personnel.

The chancellor whose approval is required in item Functions of the Graduate Council, 1, is an ex-officio, voting, member of the graduate council, as are also the directors of all graduate schools and deans of all colleges. The University of Denver has no graduate faculty.

In contrast, the operating paper of the Oklahoma State University graduate school, the "By-Laws of the Graduate Faculty" from the "Charter and By-Laws of the General Faculty of the Oklahoma State University," approved by the Faculty and Board of Regents of the Oklahoma State University, effective October 9, 1953, presents a model of democratic

academic organization. It is to be found in the "Faculty Handbook," and while it is exceptional, it is worthy of a detailed study.

The Dean and Graduate Programs. As important as the relation of the graduate dean to budgetary arrangements, policy determination, and the like, is the relationship which has to do with the actual realization of graduate programs, the day to day functional relationships. In this regard every single graduate dean was reported to deal directly with departments. Usually this meant dealing with the chairman, but sometimes with another member of the department who had been designated for this function. It was nowhere reported that the graduate dean habitually dealt with another dean, or any other administrative officer, who in turn dealt with the departments.

When asked if there were variations in this procedure, most informants answered in the negative. It was only when asked specifically if this were true in Education did this field emerge as an exception. But it turned out to be a rather widespread exception, whether Education was structured as a division, school, or college. This matter will be discussed further in the section on Education.

Purpose and Performance. Informants were asked to state what they consider the primary objective of the graduate office. The answers, somewhat edited, are given in the column to the left below. They were also asked what they considered to be the main strength, the main accomplishment, of the graduate office in the recent past. These answers are given below in the column to the right. Both answers, arranged in random order, are given so that they may be seen together. It may be of interest to compare the stated purposes with the stated performance.

Objectives	Strengths
To control the quality of graduate work through the quality of students and faculty. To stimulate improved quality of programs.	Decentralization; involvement of the whole graduate faculty through frequent meetings, establishment of responsible committees, shift of responsibility to departments, which have improved standards.
To develop and maintain standards for the selection of graduate students, for programs, and for selection of faculty. To provide leadership for growth of graduate programs.	Equalization of standards
To develop and support superior graduate programs and individual research, stimulate new programs.	Development of fellowship support for graduate students.

To develop sound graduate programs of teaching and research. To advance the frontiers of science.	Examination of general graduate and research activities; qualifications for membership in the graduate faculty, admission to graduate work, requirements for degrees.
To enforce graduate standards, both in reference to programs and faculty. To assist departments in the development of graduate work. To approve graduate programs before being presented to the graduate council. To stimulate review of established programs. To improve the quality of students admitted to graduate work.	Enforcement of graduate standards.
To maintain standards of graduate admission and graduate faculty. To set and enforce graduate policy.	Development of standards for graduate faculty.
To maintain standards, to maintain quality, especially in the face of increased emphasis upon research; particularly funded research for the professor, which might detract from teaching, and statistical research for students, being used in areas where it is not appropriate.	Development of procedures for the selection of members of the graduate faculty.
To promote graduate programs and maintain graduate standards. To remove red tape and give more responsibility and autonomy to departments.	Decentralization of graduate programs.
To provide general leadership in graduate work; to offer guidance, improve quality, modernize, and encourage review.	Control of quality, by approval of the program of each student by the dean.
To serve as a coordinating agency; students, programs, and curricula.	Centralization; common patterns, standard admissions, procedures.

Objectives of the Graduate Office. As stated above, informants were asked to state what they considered to be the primary objective of the graduate office, the one thing they attempted to do above all others. As

can be seen in the column above to the left, most of them could not resist the temptation to name more than one. The answers have been arranged in the order of what seems to be the dominant verb; to control, to develop, to enforce, to maintain, to promote, to provide, and to serve. These verbs serve as a fairly good clue to the objectives as perceived in the graduate office and may be divided into four groups; to control and enforce, to develop and promote, to maintain, and to provide and serve. These groupings reveal four kinds of functions; the function authority, the function of leadership, the function of stewardship, and the function of service. There does not seem to be any agreement between graduate offices as to which function should be the dominant one in the graduate office.

Strengths of the Graduate Office. The answers to the question about strengths of the graduate office were much briefer, but one looks in vain for a central theme. The nearest to it is a concern with standards, sometimes of programs, at other times of the faculty or students. Two offices claim that the outstanding achievement of recent times has been an increase in centralization and two others that it has been decentralization. There is every reason to believe that the personnel of graduate offices have been more than busy, but it is not so clear that their efforts have been along the same lines or even complementary.

The Tenure of Graduate Deans. As mentioned in the introduction, the most glaring feature of the graduate offices visited in the region was the instability of the office of graduate dean. Not only were there graduate deans going and coming at a sizable rate, but also many of them held other offices concurrently as well, such as the chief academic officer of the university or the director of research. In addition, some of the offices of graduate dean had been held for a considerable time on a temporary basis. At the University of Colorado, for instance, the office had been headed by an acting dean for three years prior to the employment of Dean Archer.

The Lack of a Common Tradition. The instability in the office of graduate dean in any particular university is mirrored in the uncertainty of the office for the whole group of universities across the area. There seems to be at the present time no clarity of objectives, few traditions of responsibility, few customary procedures, and little warrant for action. Each office seems to be attempting to work out its own salvation, which may be a good deal different from that being worked out by its neighbor. The result is a certain amount of confusion, taking graduate programs in general. For instance, there is a great deal more variation in graduate organizations between universities then there is between undergraduate organizations. One is likely to wonder what holds the whole fabric of graduate work together.

The Mood of Graduate Offices. In general, graduate deans seem to favor a rather authoritarian approach to their position. One dean, at least, seemed to consider the graduate unit his own private barony. He continually referred to the operations of the graduate program in the first person, at any rate, and a close examination revealed that this was no mere literary device. On the other hand there are two trends in the opposite

direction which are worthy of some concern. One is the increased tendency to decentralize. If this means to do away with common standards and procedures, and sometimes it does, this can only add to the confusion already noted. The other is an increased emphasis upon funded research, placing the responsibility for defining research upon the funding agency, which is likely to be quite narrow. If this trend is to continue the range of scholarship produced by the various graduate schools of the region is bound to shrink considerably even as it increases in volume.

III. GRADUATE OFFICE AND THE RESEARCH FUNCTION

It goes without saying that the graduate office through its academic personnel has a great deal to do with the research of students being educated in graduate programs and to some extent with the research of the professors of the graduate faculty who are preparing the students. This section of the report does not deal with such research but rather that type which might be called the research function of the university, not in terms of pedagogy but in terms of discovery, especially discovery under contract.

Responsibility for the Research Function. Each of the ten deans, or their graduate offices, now have or have had in the past a major responsibility for the research function of their university. They may be divided into three groups; those who now have major responsibilities for research administration, those who have had administrative responsibilities in the past, and those who have policy making responsibilities.

Two graduate deans have legislative or policy making responsibilities for the research function of the university. At Kansas State the research function is the responsibility of a research coordinating council, of which the graduate dean is chairman. It is administered by three agencies of the university not connected with the graduate office. At Oklahoma State the function is the responsibility of a research coordinating committee, of which the graduate dean is chairman. It is administered by one of three directors, depending upon the discipline.

Three graduate deans and their offices have lost a major responsibility for the research function of the university which they previously had. At the University of Kansas the function was separated from the graduate office a short time ago simply because it became too large, leaving the graduate office with only small internal grants. The research function had been separated from the graduate office at Missouri even earlier for the same reason. At the University of Oklahoma the research function of the university is being merged into a new unit, which will leave that graduate office without major responsibility.

Five of the ten graduate deans still retain major responsibilities for the research function of their university. At the University of Arkansas the graduate dean is also the research coordinator for the university, except for agricultural experimentation. At the University of

Colorado the graduate dean is responsible for the research of the university except that conducted in the medical school. At Colorado State College the graduate dean is responsible for the administration of all research except small internal research grants. At Denver the graduate dean is responsible for all faculty research, internal and external, but has no responsibilities for a separate research institute. At the University of New Mexico the graduate dean is responsible for all funded research.

No graduate dean was found to be responsible for institutional research.

The Graduate Dean and Research Administration. Most of the graduate deans who are responsible for the research function of their university have an administrative organization which helps them to fulfill their research assignment. The dean at the University of Arkansas is aided by an assistant research coordinator who has an office and clerical staff of his own. He administers about seven million dollars worth of funded research and reports directly to the dean. The dean at the University of Colorado is helped by an assistant dean for research and an office of research services. The dean at Colorado State College is assisted by a bureau of research. The dean at the University of New Mexico is aided by a director of research services in the administration of about four and one half millions of dollars in funded research, including one hundred and twenty projects located in eighteen departments and divisions of the university. Only the dean at the University of Denver is without an administrative organization to help him administer about one million dollars worth of funded research.

Research Services of the Graduate Dean. The graduate dean who is charged with the research responsibility of the university not only administers the conduct of research but typically renders a number of services to members of the faculty desiring to engage in research. These include the gathering of information, sometimes by visits to Washington, and its dissemination. Another is aid in the preparation of proposals, by advice, or writing, rewriting, and editing. Typing services are common. Sometimes small grants, as seed money, are awarded. At other times unusual pieces of equipment are provided. In general, the graduate dean charged with this responsibility does what he is able to promote and expand the research function of the university.

Graduate Function and Research Function. It seems clear, even in cases where the graduate dean is charged with the responsibility for the research function, that the graduate function and the research function of the university are not the same, and in fact, are quite different. There seems to be no logical reason, except convenience, that they should both be the charge of the same administrator. The prevalence of separate research organizations under graduate deans seems to support this point. In any case, such an assignment seems to be only temporary, for if the objectives of the research function are realized it will grow so large that it will require its own unit of university administration, probably at the vice president level. This, at least, has been the trend historically.

IV. GRADUATE OFFICE AND EDUCATION

The graduate office, of course, is concerned with all graduate work within the university, but on this visit especial inquiries were made concerning one field, Education. The following section deals with this field, including such topics as how it relates to the graduate office, the degrees granted in it, the advisement for its programs, and estimations concerning the quality of its programs.

Education as a Graduate Concern. In each of the ten universities where the figures were available, the number of students enrolled in graduate work in Education proved to be rather large, representing a considerable amount of graduate school effort. The numbers and percentages are given in the table below. The figures represent a tally or estimate for a recent term and have been rounded off to to the nearest fifty students. The percentages have been calculated from these. It will be seen that the graduate students in Education account for a number amounting to from about fifteen to thirty three per cent, leaving out the sixty six per cent for Colorado State College, of the graduate students in the university. One would be forced to conclude that graduate education in Education is a major responsibility of the graduate deans of the universities and of the offices of which they are the administrators. This would seem to imply that Education programs should command a considerable amount of his time and occupy a fair amount of his thinking. Such, however, does not seem to be the case.

Arkansas	500	33%
Colo. S. C.	650	66%
Kansas	400	19%
Kans. State	200	16%
New Mexico	400	20%
Oklahoma	400	14%
Okla. State	400	22%

The Graduate Dean and Education Programs. As reported earlier, graduate deans habitually deal directly with departments on matters having to do with graduate programs, except in the case of Education. However, it should not be overlooked that this exception became apparent only upon close and intentional interrogation. Education clearly does not occupy the forefront of the thoughts of graduate offices when thinking of graduate programs.

Education, for all the variations within it, seems continually to get all lumped together. At one institution only Physical Education and Vocational Education are separated out from Education. At another Education is a division and is treated as a department. At another the head of a school of Education functions as a department chairman for graduate programs. At another the college of Education has no departments so the dean functions as a department chairman for graduate Education. At two others the college of Education is departmentalized but the whole college is treated as a department for graduate purposes, with the dean as chairman. The formal organization does not seem to matter, all programs on a graduate level in Education usually get treated as a whole.

Resources for Education Programs. When asked if graduate programs in Education were encouraged to use the full resources of the university for their programs, most informants replied in the affirmative. The same ones

judged that this effort had been somewhat successful. Most, however, advanced the opinion that this has been and still is a serious weakness in graduate studies in Education.

Advisement for Education Programs. None of the ten universities use professional advisors for graduate programs in Education, either part time or full time. All graduate advising, on any degree level, is distributed among the professors in the field.

Graduate Degrees in Education. The ten universities offer a variety of graduate degrees in Education, the usual pattern being a Master's degree, an intermediate degree or certificate, and a doctoral degree. As a matter of fact, they total up to six basic degrees, one diploma, and three certificates. They are given in the table below.

University	Master's			Intermediate	Doctoral	
Arkansas			M.Ed.	Diploma of Adv. Study	Ed.D.	
Colorado	M.A.		M.Ed.	Profess. Certificate	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Colo. S. C.	M.A.			Ed.S.	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Denver	M.A.				Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Kansas	M.A.	M.S.	M.Ed.	Ed.S.	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Kans. State		M.S.				
Missouri	M.A.	M.S.	M.Ed.	Certificate of Special.	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
New Mexico	M.A.			Ed. Spec. Certificate	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Oklahoma			M.Ed.	Profess. Certificate	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
Okla. State		M.S.		Ed.S.	Ed.D.	Ph.D.

It will be noted that the Master of Arts is most frequently offered in Education on the Master's level, with the Master of Education following closely. The Master of Science degree, usually designated as in Education, is awarded almost as often. There seems to be no clear understanding of a customary Master's degree to grant in Education. In one case the student has a choice of two degrees, in another he has a choice of three. At the University of Missouri this choice is even carried further, where he may be granted a Master of Arts in Education, Master of Education, Master of Science for Teachers, Master of Arts for Teachers of French, or a Master of Arts for Teachers of Spanish. There seems to be no limit to the possibilities of multiplying degrees.

All of the universities which grant a doctorate, except Denver, offer the student an intermediate degree, diploma, or certificate. In the table degrees are indicated by initials; Ed.S., Educational Specialist degree; while the other awards are spelled out. All of them, degrees included, are given for some kind of professional specialization. They may or may not be used as a first step on the way to the doctorate. The closeness in the

number of degree and nondegree awards seems to indicate that there is little agreement as to whether this level of intermediate award should be a degree or not.

Nine of the ten universities offer a doctorate of Education, the Ed.D., while eight of the nine offer also the Ph.D. in Education. It might be observed that a choice of the two degrees in so many cases would seem to indicate a certain amount of uncertainty as to the proper degree to award students in this field at this level. If one traces the degrees across the table one gets some interesting patterns; M.A., Professional Certificate, Ed.D.; M.Ed., Professional Certificate, Ph.D.; M.S., Ed.S., Ph.D., and so on. In three cases the foundation of the Ed.D. must be an M.A. and in one case the Ph.D. must use the M.Ed. for its foundation. Such possibilities of patterns seem to belie whatever theoretical differences there are supposed to exist between the degrees and the result must be a great deal of confusion as to their meaning.

Programs in Foundations of Education. Two of the ten universities offer degree granting programs of graduate study in the Cultural Foundations of Education. The University of Denver offers a Ph.D. in History of Education, Philosophy of Education, or Sociology of Education. The University of Kansas awards the Ph.D., and rarely the Ed.D., in History of Education and Philosophy of Education. Programs for the degrees were not available in the graduate offices.

The Ed.D. and Ph.D. in Education. At no university were there actual copies of programs of doctoral study in Education readily available. None were gathered at the time of the visit and none recieved since. Therefore the following material is based upon information gathered at the time of the interview.

The University of Arkansas only offers the Ed.D. in Education, but in comparison to the Ph.D. offered in other disciplines the program of course work is longer. Candidates for the Ed.D. write a dissertation under the same instructions as those for the Ph.D. but the fulfillment of the requirement is considered in general to be weaker. At the University of Colorado the Ph.D. requires a foreign language while the Ed.D. does not. The Ed.D. candidates conduct a study instead of the dissertation required of Ph.D. candidates and it is considered less rigorous. At Colorado State College the Ph.D. emphasizes research while the Ed.D. emphasizes research and the practical application of it. At the University of Denver the Ph.D. is reserved almost exclusively for those majoring in Higher Education. At the University of Kansas the Ph.D. is considered largely a research degree and the Ed.D. theoretical and practical. Foreign languages are no longer a point of difference since they have been removed from the minimum requirements for the Ph.D. At the University of Missouri the Ph.D. requires foreign languages which the Ed.D. program does not. Otherwise the Ph.D. is thought to emphasize research and the Ed.D. to be more specialized. At the University of New Mexico the Ed.D. program is longer in course work than is the Ph.D. degree. At the University of Oklahoma the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. must meet the same basic requirements, but in fact the Ed.D. is longer in

course work. At Oklahoma State University the Ph.D. is available only to those students who major in Higher Education.

Certainly in the written programs for the two degrees, where there are such, there must be more fundamental differences between them than these. What is of interest here, however, is that these are the kinds of differences seen from the graduate office and by those who administer graduate programs. If they seem trivial this may be because functionally, aside from programs as written, the differences are indeed trivial. This cannot but help to contribute to the uncertainty which exists between the meanings of the two degrees.

Status of Graduate Degrees in Education. On the other hand, there seems to be little doubt in the minds of most informants that degrees in Education are not equal in quality to degrees in other disciplines, even when the degree granted is the same. A doctoral degree in Education, for instance, is not generally considered equal to a Ph.D. in another discipline, even when it is the Ph.D. itself.

When compared to the Ph.D., the Ed.D. was judged by most informants to be inferior. In only one case was their equivalency clearly maintained. However, some pointed out that they are two kinds of degrees, that they serve different purposes. On the other hand, others clearly stated that they considered the Ed.D. a weaker, less rigorous degree. In no case was it maintained that the Ed.D. is superior in status than the Ph.D. degree.

Status and Understanding of Education Programs. It seems more than a coincidence that the field the informants in general were the least informed about should also be the field about which they seemed to have the most reservations as to quality. To repeat, one would have thought that a field which provides, on the average, about one fifth of the graduate enrollment would be of central concern to the graduate office and its dean. One would have thought, further, that this concern would have been translated into action toward improvement so that this rather important aspect of the total graduate program could be viewed with pride rather than recalled, so often, with regret.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based upon this study, discussions with the personnel of the ten universities, a variety of printed material, and a longstanding and active interest in the problems of higher education, the following observations are offered for whatever consideration they are worth.

The Graduate Organization. Too many graduate deans are part time as graduate deans. Too often they are assigned additional offices, such as vice president for academic affairs, or assigned extra duties, such as the coordination of funded research. The office of graduate dean needs a clearer definition of duties and the dean needs more time to fulfill them.

There seems to be no confusion about the relative status of associate and assistant deans, but there needs to be a clarification of their proper roles. It is suggested that assistant deans actually assist the dean and that associate deans continue to specialize, but with the added ability and authority to replace the dean when necessary. Associate deans should be associates of the dean, not his juniors.

Specialized graduate schools granting their own graduate degrees should be avoided. Also to be avoided are secondary deans for graduate study in units of the university other than the graduate office. If a scholar is to be an associate dean for graduate study in liberal arts, for instance, he should be an associate dean of the graduate school rather than the college of arts and sciences.

Graduate deans, in some way, should be given a faculty of their own and their own budget which follows the faculty. His program of activities should not depend, in any sense, upon charity. One way to do this would be to transfer the faculty member, and his budget, to the graduate college when he is approved for a certain class of graduate work. Another way would be to consider all graduate appointments as joint appointments, requiring approval for hiring, salary increases, tenure, and such things by both deans, each with his own budget. However it is done, it must be done, because as graduate work increases in volume the problem becomes more and more acute. If it is not solved graduate deans will feel forced to turn to unusual, non-instructional, sources, such as research grants, for funds.

The graduate faculty should have regular procedures with which to select an elected graduate council, which would serve as a policy making body at the pleasure of the graduate faculty. The essential function of the graduate faculty, which could be delegated to the council, is legislative, not advisory. While it is not crucial, it would probably be better if the dean, whose essential function is administrative, were not chairman of the graduate council. Part of the problem of the instability of the office of graduate dean could be solved by more effective participation of the graduate faculty and the graduate council. This is another reason, too, for the graduate faculty being relatively permanent instead of being, in some sense, borrowed from another university unit.

It is not clear that the best way to organize a university is by departments, but however it is organized the graduate school should deal with consistent units. If one college is to be dealt with as a unit, all colleges should be dealt with the same. If the graduate school is to deal with departments it should deal with them throughout the university. Of course measures should be taken to insure that the organization of a department represents a legitimate field of study, but to treat a group of departments gathered into a division, school, or college as a single department is academically derogatory and unworthy of a graduate office.

The objectives of the graduate office should be stated as nearly as possible in behavioral terms. The graduate office should put the service function first, followed by stewardship and leadership. It should exercise

little of the authoritarian function. The development of common aims among graduate schools is sorely needed, as is increased communication among them. This would help prevent duplication of efforts and aid in the development of a shared common stock of information and ideas with which to carry out the mission of the graduate office.

Graduate offices should not be left to the management of temporary deans, however well qualified. Graduate deans should be found quicker and retained longer. Associate deans should be selected with the anticipation that they replace a dean and stand ready to do so at any time, in the same institution or another. The development of qualified graduate deans is a responsibility of every university. The office is too important to leave open and too demanding to be filled by the unqualified.

There needs to be more centralization without domination in the graduate offices. Common minimum requirements need to be agreed upon by the graduate faculty, or the council, through regual democratic processes. Abdication of this responsibility to the departments only adds to the confusion which is already great enough to be a serious problem.

Lastly, graduate offices need to take the broadest view of scholarship and encourage it in all its forms. Contemporary fads should be avoided as much as possible. It should be born in mind that the pursuit of new knowledge, which is the announced aim of almost every doctoral program, is likely to lead anywhere. No one knows from where the next important piece of new knowledge is to come. Scholarship means the ability to handle the material in the field, of course, but it also means the ability to discover, uncover, and invent new fields. Fortunately scholarship can be rather well identified apart from its content, and scholarship, it is suggested, is the business of the graduate school.

The Graduate Office and the Research Function. The graduate dean, as such, should not be responsible for the research function of the university. Where it is necessary or expedient for the administrator of both of these very important activities to be embodied in the same person it should be clearly recognized and the time anticipated when they can be separated. There is no logical reason either that the graduate dean should be chairman of the research council; he may or may not be the best qualified man. Certainly his office does not guarentee that he is. The reason is that the research function of the university and the research function of the graduate school have little in common, one being primarily productive and utilitarian in nature and the other primarily pedagogic. The graduate school should be left with just those responsibilities in research which serve its pedagogic purpose. The function of the graduate school is to produce scholars, not research.

The research function of the university should be assembled into a separate unit of administration which is provided with the necessary staff, equipment, and other resources which make it likely that it can accomplish its assignment. Its activities, too, should be thought of as a service,

and every measure should be taken to be of aid to anyone who is inclined to conduct research. The function of this unit is the production of research, wherever it is to be found and by whomever it is to be conducted.

The Graduate Office and Education. Graduate work in Education should be recognized as an important part of the total graduate program, and accordingly should be given as much attention as it warrants. Graduate offices should not be allowed to think of such programs as something that is taking place over there in Education, in which real scholars would not be very interested nor a great deal concerned. If scholarship in Education is as poor as some graduate offices seem to think it is they should no longer be allowed to ignore the condition but be specifically charged with working toward its improvement. There should be no stepchildren in graduate studies.

As mentioned above, the graduate office should deal with consistent units. If these units are to be departments, the departments in Education should be recognized on a basis of equality with all other departments. If they are not worthy of such recognition they should either be combined, realigned, or abolished.

Graduate programs preparing scholars in any field should use the full resources of the university. Because of its eclectic nature, this is especially true in Education.

Advisement in Education should be distributed among the active scholars in the field. It should be considered an important part of the regular process of instruction and should be recognized as such.

One pattern of degrees should be chosen for Education. Preference should be given to an academic pattern; B.A., M.A., Ph.D. It is questionable whether Education is a profession requiring professional degrees; M.Ed., Ed.D., and it is certainly not, as suggested by the M.S., a science. An academic pattern comes nearer to reporting the facts of the case and would have the tendency to encourage Education to further clarify its academic status. Intermediate degrees, diplomas, and certificates should be avoided, since their real basic purpose is to advance the salary of persons to whom they are awarded. The programs are usually too short for serious specialization and they have little to do with scholarship. If an intermediate award program must be accepted, preference should be shown for the program which awards the degree, at least this keeps it within the academic framework. The terminal degree should, of course, be the Ph.D. Among many there are two outstanding reasons. One is that if those desiring a doctorate in Education cannot qualify for the Ph.D. they should not be awarded a doctorate of any kind. The second and much more important reason is that there is no prospect, regardless of the quality of the program, of the Ed.D. being accepted as equivalent to the Ph.D. No prospect whatsoever, and it should be abandoned. Graduate offices should not be content to allow the awarding in any field, especially Education, of what really amount to second class degrees.

Lastly, graduate offices must become better informed about graduate programs in Education, take a more vital role in their development, and

help them to attain an indisputable status of equality with the graduate programs of other disciplines. To do less would be to fail a clear responsibility.

Leadership and Graduate Studies. In general, the greatest need in graduate studies, it seems, is leadership. Individual graduate offices need to be stabilized upon a perpetual solid base of faculty consent, approval, and participation, and through the customary academic processes of policy determination. The profession of the administration of graduate programs needs leadership in the discovery of solutions to the many serious problems with which every graduate program is faced. Order must be brought out of the confusion of ad hoc degrees, independent programs, departmental anarchy, fadistic research, and all the symptoms of the impending chaos into which graduate work is likely to fall. Leadership must be early recognized, consciously developed, and amply rewarded to insure continuing progress in achieving the primary objective of the graduate enterprise, the development of scholarship within the academic community of the university.